

REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated 18 May 2004. Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 6, 8, 10 and 17-18 have been amended. Claims 12-18 have been allowed. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was amended to correct a typographical error and no new matter was added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 12-18 are allowed.

Claim Objections

Claims 17 and 18 are objected to for the reasons stated on pages 2 the Office Action. Claims 17 and 18 have been amended as per the Office Action's suggestions. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected to for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. Claims 8 and 10 have been amended as suggested by the examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) for the reasons stated on pages 4-5 of the Office Action as being anticipated by Rajski *et al.* (US-5991909), hereinafter "**Rajski**".

Regarding Claim 1, the Office Action cites both Figure 1 and column 5, lines 54-59 of **Rajski** as teaching every element thereof. Applicants respectfully disagree, with traverse.

Assuming that **Rajski** discloses a test unit, a loading unit and a making unit, **Rajski** still fails to teach every element of Claim 1, which recites, *inter alia*., "... a test unit for receiving a first reference signature indicative of faults at a first frequency ... the masking unit generating a second reference signature ... wherein the second reference signature replaces the first reference signature such that the test unit is responsive to faults at a second frequency." **Rajski** does not disclose signature signals indicative of faults and a test unit which responds to faults that relate to any frequency. Therefore, **Rajski** fails to teach both a "reference signature indicative of faults at a first frequency" and a "reference signature such that the test unit is responsive to faults at a second frequency", as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by **Rajski**, for at least the reasons stated above.

Likewise, Claims 2-11 each depend from Claim 1 and necessarily include each of the elements and limitations thereof. Thus, **Rajski** fails to anticipate or render obvious these dependent claims.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) for the reasons stated on page 6 of the Office Action as being unpatentable by **Rajski** in view of Kim (US-5574733). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The above claim rejection is based, in part, on the contention that **Rajski** discloses the elements of Claim 1, from which Claim 4 depends. Claim 1 is patentably distinct from **Rajski** as described above. **Kim** fails to cure the deficiencies of **Rajski**, as it does not disclose or suggest signature signals indicative of faults and a test unit which responds to faults that relate to any frequency. Thus, the above combination is legally deficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the claim elements.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1, and necessarily include each of the elements and limitation thereof. It is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed; reconsideration of the rejections and an early and favorable allowance of this case is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Frank Chau
Registration No. 34,136
Aniket A. Patel
Registration No. 55,525

Correspondence Address:

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury NY, 11797
(516) 692-8888
FAX (516) 692-8889